G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 105

1904

(Mus2)

Serial Nos. 1-8

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for Sept 19

SUBJECT.

Appointment of a Khazi of the Kurgal Taluk

The D.C. Tumkur Dt
1127 Dj 30.9.19

Confirms the ——

Chmette

W D 1950—GPB—30,000 28-1 19

G.R.S.11] 1904.-5

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Muznai)

NOTES.

File No. 105

FILE HEADING.

Appeal- petition of Syed Mukdum Hussain praying that his minor son may be appointed Khazi of the Kunigal Taluk.

From

Syed Mukdum Hussain

~~No.~~ Petition Dated 5-16 May 1905 Received

Diary No. 4175	Enclos. -	Spare Copies -	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Sl 2. To, The Dy. Commr, Tumkur Distt

Docket no 4310 Dy 23d May 1905

Forwards Sl 1 for report with records.

To, - Syed Mukdum Hussain,

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000 -3-4-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 165 of 1904

Serial No.	
	Encl no 4311 Dy 23d May 1908. Intimates the above.
3.	From, The Dy Commr, Cuddapah Dist. Letter no 812 Dy 14th March 1907. Reports that Syed Abdul Kareem Khadri alias Saheb Peer, a son of the elder sister of the deceased Khazi has been appointed to the office, that the applt who is married to the youngest sister of the late Khazi failed to appear before the Amildar in spite of notices, to substantiate his ~~claims~~ allegations.
4.	To, The Dy. Commr, Cuddapah Dist. Docket no. 4850 Dy 11.4.07. Requests that the Summons may be served once again on the petr.
5.	From, The Dy. Commr, Cuddapah Dist. Letter no. 15 Dy 9th July 1910. Submits further report on the subject.

One Syed Ali was the Khazi of Kunjpal Taluk the office being hereditary in his family. He was unmarried. He died in June 1904 leaving a mother and four sisters. His mother

NOTE—Contn sheet

55,000—27 4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 105 of 1904

Serial No.

A (Petn to Kungal amildar on 5 3 1904)

B (D C's order dated 9 10 05, No 471)

C (Deposition before Kungal amildar on 11 3 1904)

D+E. (Genealogical tables)

F (Genealogical table)

G (Genealogical table)

H (Deposition before Kungal amildar on 24 12 1907)

And his accountant admitted the son of the eldest sister to be appointed khaya, his father being formata during his minority. This was disputed with. The husband of one of the younger sisters opposed this plea and claimed the office for his own son - He urged that (1) as he was an agnate of the deceased, (2) as his father and grandmother and the deceased's paternal grandmother were sisters, and (3) as he is the sister's husband of the deceased, his son had a better claim.

Of the three relationships urged the last is admitted and is common to the appellant and the Respondent

The second is partially admitted it being said that the grandmothers were step sisters and not uterine sisters

The first is utterly denied. While appellant says that one of the ancestors Syed Yunus had a younger son Syed Ismayil, the other party denies the existence of Syed Ismayil & says that Syed Yunus had only one son

Appellant says that one Syed Abdul Rahiman of Goorikere on the Chattakere Island, an old man of 70 or 80, can speak about this; but adds that the old man is in his dotage. His party has not been examined as any statement that he may make can have no value.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

55,000—27 4 09

(4

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 165 of 1904

Serial No.

I. J. & K.

I: Petn to Kunigal amildar on 22.2.1904
J: Petn to D.C. on 7.3.04
K: Deposition before Kunigal amildar on 1.4.04)

The documents ex petition and deposition relied upon in support of this allegation address themselves on their face to the only reasonable request that the eldest sister's son might be appointed the mother and aunt of the deceased Khaja

~~& the petitioners also say that the officiating family priest in the days of the deceased Syed Ibrahim referred to above was Syed Bodan.~~

In requesting that the eldest sister's son might be appointed the mother and aunt of the deceased Khaja said that the boy's father was the Dy Collr, that he was maintaining them and that he was doing the Khaja's duties when deceased Syed Ibrahim was young and when his predecessor and uncle Syed Ibrahim was too old.

Appellant does not admit this and says that Syed Ibrahim's son-in-law Syed Bodan was discharging the duties. He has produced Khanehumari and to show that respondent's father lived separately.

This does not appear to be an important matter.

One more document produced by the appellant has to be noticed. This is a will alleged to have been executed by one Syed Mustafa, uncle & amildar and cousin of the deceased Khaja in favour of appellant. The witness on one of the attestation say that it was executed in

L
Will dated 22.5.1902)

M & N.
Depositions before Kunigal amildar on 15.6.08 + 29.1.09, respectively)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27.4.09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. 105 of 1914

(5

Serial No.

Mustapha of the two other allegations one is dead and it is not known who the other is The Amildar says that the will cannot be genuine

Notices have been issued to the parties for the 29th Inst.

Submitted to Hon'ble Court

Ambhaimaye

20/7/1910

P S Printed copy of Govt order No. 3832 of 18 4 1905 about the Khojahs of Bombay Collectorate & petitioner is absent up for reference.

Ambhaimaye

1712

41

Rd on 25-7-10

199.

21/7/1910

Appellant (Sayad Makdum Hussen) Rep. Sayad Abdul Razak Sha - Khadem (father of the Khazi now appointed.

The appellant claims as being one agnate of the deceased but of this, there seems to be no proof.

His son respt's son are both sister's son & respt's son being the elder & the office being indivisible, he seems to be a preferible claimant for the office.

The appellant says that

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

has some witnesses, but he named only one & he is said to be not in his proper senses, and to have only occasional lucid intervals.

There seems to be no reason to allow him to get witnesses now.

—

Respt has nothing to add

—

Order will be passed later on—

29/7/10

Re-submitted—

× Slip O) In his petition dated 29th March 1904 to the Amildar, the Aplt Slip P) has mentioned 26 witnesses. A notice was issued to them for the 1st of the following month. On that day, Slip K) 16 witnesses have been ex of whom it is found that 10 been referred to in the

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. 163 of 1904

(7

Serial
No.

Stp 9)

In his petition dated 9th Feby. 1909 presented to the Kunigal Sub Divl officer, the aplt has complained against the Amildar adding that he did not examine his witnesses. The aplt is reported to have been absent though often served with notices.

Stp 8 R
by cmmnd Letter
No 812
dt 14-3-1910

Amildar of a

8/7/1910

Ask the D.C. to get the statements of remaining witnesses recorded & to give his opinion on the whole evidence concerning the merits of the claim

Submitted with a Dft
3-8-10

1/8/10

Letter & others

9
4/8/1910

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

8

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

D. 1541

Z

Dy Commrs. report re Municipal Khazi,

The Amildars report refd to in the Dy Cs report dy 6-3-1913, is torn & one of the pieces is of littlest which it is not possible to read & understand his report.

May the Dy. Commr. be requested to send up another copy of it.?

M 10.3.1913 10/3/13

Piece together the report. You may ask separately for a copy of the report to be caused to be sent. the records may be kept here.

28 10/3

N.B – Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

a V 11/3

G.R.S. III—3]

9

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Submits with a D/R.

M 12-3-19 RL Typed

Approved

18/3/19.

No. 2851 D20. 2. C4 Typed 15-4-19

To D.C. Trunkeer

Calls for a report in the matter

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

10

Jung File No. 105 of 1914

Serial No. 7

From, the Dy Commr, Tumkur Dist,
Letter no. 1588 Dy 16-6-1919.
Submits requisite extract of Kunigal Amildar's Report no 1077 Dy 6-3-1913

The Amildar's report Dy 31st march 1919 summarizes the further evidence recorded by him. The Amildar reports that there is nothing to show that the applt — Syed Mukhtum Hussain is a member of the late Khazi's family except that he is the son-in-law of the family. The late Khazi — Syed Ally died as a bachelor and had 2 sisters. The elder sister was married to the present Khazi's father, while the applt claims the office as the husband of the late Khazi's younger sister, and the Dy Commr thinks that the applt cannot succeed to the office.

Submits for orders.

4/9/19 8/9/19

Orders)

5.9.19

Submit with ref to the order dated 1/8/10 on page 7. (The D.C. has sent a report after 8 years)

3rd December)

705/10/9/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. [illegible] of 1906

11

Serial
No.

[illegible]

Jan
13/9/09
[illegible]
15-9

8/9/09 Submitted with D.P.S.O.
16.9.09
[illegible]
[illegible]
To Secy

3rd member [illegible]
19.9.09
[illegible]
20/9

Issue
24.9.09
[illegible]
24/9

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

T. R. S. 111-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

6670 12

File No. 125 of 1917

Serial No.

C. To, by. Commr. Jammu Divn.
No. 1127 dy. 30.9.19.
Confirms the by. Commr's order
appointing Syed Abdul Kaium Khadri
alias Sahib Peer, as Khaji of Kunigal
Tk

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

13

MUZRAI

1901

From The Secretary
Muzy Dept 4"

To
The Dy Commr
Tumkur Dist 4"

Dated 23
Despatched May 1905.
Received
General No. 4310 & 4311
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. Ones

The accompanying petition
No 4175 of 5th May 1905, presented
by Syed Murtham Hussain of
Kunigal praying that his
minor son may be appointed
as the Khazi of the Kunigal
taluk in place of the deceased
Khazi, the duties ~~whereof~~ thereof being
attended to by him during the
former's minority, is forwarded
to the Dy Commr Tumkur Dt
~~with a request that~~ for submission of
the

14

Connected with the case together with a detailed report thereon, ~~may be submitted to this office at an early date~~

By order -
15/5/05
Secretary.

DFP)

15/5/05

Put to the Hon'ble [illegible]

Rupplementfile

MF 105-84



ہے۔ اس کے بعد ہم نے اس کی تشریح کی ہے۔ اس کے بعد ہم نے اس کی تشریح کی ہے۔ اس کے بعد ہم نے اس کی تشریح کی

1907

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

18

Deputy Commissioners office
Tumkur District.

Dated, Tumkur, 14th March 1907.

From

K. Doraswami Iyer Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esqr B.A.
Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maha Rajah of
Mysore, Muzrae Department.
Bangalore.

Sir.

With reference to your docket No. 4310 dated the 20th May 1905 calling for a report on the petition of Syed Mukh dum Hussain, praying that his minor son may be appointed as the Khazee of the Kunigal Taluk, I have the honor to state that there is a Khazee's service at Kunigal carrying an annual Ready money allowance of Rupees 7-3-a. This service was being performed by one Syed Ali Sahib, who died a bachelor on the 1st 1904, leaving behind him

several heirs as shown on paper
No 253 on the accompanying verna-
cular file. A reference to this
paper which is a genealogical
table shows that Syed Abdul
Kareem Khadri alias Saheb Peer
is a son of the elder sister
named Sinatum Bibi of the
deceased Khazee and is, as such,
the nearest heir to the deceased
Khazee. His appointment to the
vacant Khazee office was un-
acceptable to all the heirs of the
late Khazee except the petitioner.
In these circumstances, Saheb
Peer was appointed to that office,
and his father was ordered to
officiate as Khazee until the
former who was undergoing
schooling became fit to take up
the duties himself. It is against
this order that the petitioner has
appealed.

The petitioner is married
to the youngest sister named
Mohadin Bibi of the late
He is reported to be

Prabhavana halli in the Gubbi Taluk. He claims the Khazee office to his minor son, Syed Meeran Mohadeen, on the ground that he is a descendant of the late Khazee's family besides being married to his youngest sister. Though several notices were served on him (the petitioner) to appear before the Amildar of the Kunigal Taluk, and to substantiate his allegations, he failed to do so.

The petition received with the docket under reference is also returned herewith

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

M. Sonnenschmidt

Asst Deputy Commissioner

TML

21

Mur C 105-1904

Mur 1 \]

190

From

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kanara District

Dated

Despatched 11.4.07

Received

General No 1850
No.

Enclosure No. 21 Folio

His letter no 812, dated 14th March 1907, reporting on the appeal petition of Syed Muhdum Hussain, praying that his minor son may be appointed Khazi of the Kumgal Taluk

---

From the above, it is observed that the petitioner did not appear before the Amildar of the Kumgal

GPR—8 000—21-7 08

Taluk, ~~to~~ to substantiate
his allegations made in the
appeal petition though he
was served with summonses
As he is however ~~understood~~
stated to be residing in Prabhavanahalli
village of the Gubbi Taluk, and
as he has stated in his appeal
petition that he has documents
in his possession in support of
his claim, has the honor to
request that the ~~tahsildar~~
of the Gubbi Taluk may be
instructed to cause the summons
may be served once again
to the petitioner through the tahsildar
of the Gubbi Taluk, ~~and he may~~
~~be heard and the matter reported~~
~~upon to Govt.~~

The enclosures are rtd herewith
for reference and re-submission

By order

DKL) 7/4/07

Secretary

ps
640

D 464

From The Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District,

Tumkur.

To

The Secretary to the Government of

Mysore. General & Revenue Departments,

Bangalore.

Dated 9th July 1910.

Despatched 11th --do--

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No. Three files

Reporting on the claim of Mukdum Hussain to the Khaji Office at Kunigal.

Vide note.

13/7/10

GPB—70 reams—27-12-09

28

Office of the
Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District,
Dated Tumkur 8/9th July 1910.

From,

K. Doraswami Iyer Esq..
Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

To,

C.S.Balasundaram Iyer Esq.. B.A.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments,(Muzrai),
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 4850, dated the 11th April 1907, in the matter of the claim to the Khaji Office of the Kunigal Taluk, and requesting that Summons may be issued once more to Mukdum Hussain to produce certain documents said to be in his possession to substantiate his claim to this Khaji Office, I have the honor to state that the said Mukdum Hussain appeared before the Amildar on 24-12-1907 in response to the Summons issued a second time and claimed the Khaji Office on the following grounds:-

(1) As a cousin of the late Khaji, the petitioner claiming his descent from Syed Ismayal, 2nd son of Syed Yunnus, said to be the common ancestor of the 2 branches of the family (paper 33 File I). In support of this, the appellant cites the petitions of the Mussalmans dated 22-2-1904 and 7-8-1904 to the Amildar and the Deputy Commissioner and their depositions before the Amildar Mr. Guru Rao on 1-4-1904 in which they say that the deceased Khaji and the appellant are cousins. (Paper Nos. 2,9 & 19 - File I).

(2) As a sort of guardian or adviser of the late Khaji Syed Ali and manager of his estate: The will executed on 22-5-1902 by the late Amildar Mr. Syed Mustapha just before his death is cited as conferring this authority or managership. (Paper 28 File I). In this connection, he also deposed that Syed Abdul Razak (Respondent)

during the Khaji duty on behalf of his minor son, was never managing the family affairs of the late Mr. Mustapha, as alleged by the late Khaji's mother, Pacha Bi and that he (Respondent) was living separately. Copies of mutchalika dated 23-2-1903 executed by the late Khaji Syed Ali and others and of Khanesumari accounts for 1902-03, 1903-04 are cited to prove that the Respondent was not living as a member of Syed Mustafa's family (vide Ferist Nos. 27, 30 and 31- File I).

On the other hand, the genealogical table produced by Pacha Bi, the mother of the late Khaji, mentions that Syed Mustapha was the only grandson of Syed Yunnus, (Paper No.13 File II) whereas, the genealogical table produced by the appellant shows that Syed Yunnus had 2 sons -- Syed Mustapha and Syed Ismayal.

Turning to the documents produced by the appellant to prove his claim, the Amildar reports that the execution of the will by the late Amildar Mr. Mustapha, who has signed his name in Hindustani and Kanada, is questionable, in as much as out of the 4 witnesses, one is unknown, the other is dead and the remaining two are not at all reliable, from private enquiries made as well as on account of inconsistencies in their statements. Ganga setti, one of the witnesses, is reported as not very worthy of credit. Moreover, the late Mr. Syed Mustapha is ascertained not to have signed his name in Kanada at any time, Judgment of his written in 1874 in Kanarese (paper No. 25 - File II is signed by him in Hindustani.

Under the above circumstances, the evidence adduced by the appellant to prove his claim is of a questionable nature; The appellant is reported to have been wantonly evading to present himself in spite of Summonses issued to him about 5 times. As regards relation to the deceased Khaji, it is observed that Syed Abdul Razak, the doing duty Khaji, is the husband of an elder Sister of the late Khaji and is also reported to be doing his duties to the satisfaction of all, whereas, the appellant is the husband of an younger Sister

The records relating to the case are herewith forwarded

for

25

for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Alfred Chapman

For Deputy Commissioner.

bg

G.R.S. 29A]

1910 - 11

From

The Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To The Dy. Commissioner,
Tumkur Dt.

Dated

Despatched August 1910

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

His letter No. 15 dated 9th July 1910, reporting on the claim of Syed Muktdum Hussain to the Khaji office of Kunigal.

Has the honor to request that the Dy. Commissioner will be so good as to get the Statements of all the witnesses referred to in the list presented by the Petitioner on 29th March 1904 and any other witness the parties may

27

The Dy. Commissioner is further requested to give his opinion on the whole evidence concerning the merits of the case.

2. The Vernacular records are returned herewith for reference and re submission.

By order

Sd/ 4/7/1910

for Offg. Secretary

ad
7/8

G R.S. 29A]

19 28

From

Secy to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy Commr

Dated Jumkur 29th

Despatched

Received 0 2-7-28

General No 2877

No '05 ms 4

Enclosure No. 1

In continuation of this office docket no 556 dated 18th August 1911 has the honor to forward herewith petition regd no D. 1603 from Syed Makdum Hussein residing at Prabureamathalli in the Gubbi Taluk, praying that his witness

GPB—20,000—24-10-10.

were in the Kurigal

Khazi case and to request

that the return of the detailed report

already called for may

kindly be expedited

By order,

for Secy. to Govt.

4/5/11

1335

30

18 19

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District,
Dated Tumkur, the 5th February 1919.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your D.O. No.1797/Muz.105-04 dated 16th January 1919, calling for a report on the petition of Syed Mukdum Hussain regarding the office of Khazi of Kunigal, I write to say that the vernacular records pertaining to the said office are traced out in this office The original English records are misl-id and are not readily available

I would therefore request you to kindly favour me with copies of correspondence available in your office so that a report may be sent on the points required.

Yours sincerely,

for Dy Commr

G. Arayamudu Iyengar, Esqr., B.A.,B.L.
Joint Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

31

G R S VI—G 32]

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section Tuticorin
File No. 105-04
Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

( )

, the 191

No 2566/Estb/

Date of issue 22-2-1909

Signed by Mr. de Lindsay

To Dear Sir,

With reference to your D. O. letter No. 119 dt. 5-2-19 stating that the original English records re Khasi Case of Kunigal were misland in your office and requesting that Copies of the same may be supplied from this office, I am desired to forward herewith the Copies required. I am also to request that the reply the matter may be sent at an early

Yours obediently

To,

A. Subramanya Iyer Esqr. B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

List of enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

WD 86—GPB—60,000—15 11 16

From

The Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District, T u m k u r.

61/90

To

The Muzarai Secretary to Govt.,

B a n g a l o r e.

1541

18 19

Dated 6th March 1919.

O C 1588/18-19

Enclosures No. 2 files

Submits further report in the matter of the claim of Syed Mukdeen Hussain to the office of Khaji of Kunigal.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District,

Dated, Tumkur, 6th March 1919.

From

A. Subramanya Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

To

G. Aravamudu Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzarai Department,

BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2877 dated 10th May 1911, calling for further report in the matter of the claim of Syed Mukdeen Hussain to the office of Thaji of Kunigal, I have the honour to state that the depositions given before the Amildar of Kunigal by those who the petitioner wants to be examined in his favour do not show that he is a member of the family of the late Thaji Syed Ally, except that he is the Son-in-law of the family. Syed Ally died a bachelor and he had two sisters. The elder sister was married to the present Thaji's father and the younger sister to the petitioner. Accordingly the office of the Thaji after the death of Syed Ally was given to the present holder, the son of the elder Sister of the late Thaji. The petitioner being the husband of the younger sister of the late Thaji, could not succeed to the office of Thaji, after the demise of Syed Ally.

The Vernacular records ending with the Amildar's report No. 1077 dated 6th March 1915 pertaining to this case are herewith forwarded.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

[signature]

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

33

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No. 165-04

Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

( )

the *191* .

No. 2845/

Date of issue 2-3-1919

To

Signed by Mr. M. Sundaram

The Dy. Commr,

Trichy Dist,

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 1588 Dy 6th March 1919 submitting further report in the matter of the claim of Syed Ibrahim Hussein to the office of Kazi of Kulittalai, I am directed to state that the Muslim report No. 1077 Dy 6th March 1913 ~~refer to therein, was~~ ~~received~~ found

over.

included in
~~in pieces~~ ~~with~~ the item record
sent by you is found to be in a torn condition
~~in pieces~~, one of ~~which was~~ the pieces being
~~torn~~ missing, and to request
that a copy of the said Report may
be caused to be prepared
and sent up to this office very early
for reference.

(2) The records connected with
the case are retained in
this office.

I have &c
W.D.
12/28/19.
Asst Secretary
Munz. Dept

RG
12/28/19

List of enclosure

Copied by WL 5/13

Examined by

WD 86—GPB—60,000—15-11 16

GPB—100,000—29-7-14

18.70

18.19

1918-19.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District, Tumkur.

To

The Joint Secretary to Govt. of H.H.,
the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Dated 16th April 1919.

Despatched

Received

General No. C.C 1588
No. 18-19.

66928

Enclosure No. One file

Forwarding Register Extract of Kunigal Amildars report No. 1077 dated 6/12th March 1913.

35

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District,
Dated Tumkur, the 16th April 1919.

From

A. Subramanya Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District.

To

G. Aravamudu Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Joint Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzarai Department,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 2851/Muz. 195-04 dated 29th March 1919, I have the honour to forward herewith Register Extract of Kunigal Amildar's report No. 1077 dated 6/12th March 1913 received from the Amildar, Kunigal Taluk with his report No. 525 dated 31st March 1919.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
Tumkur District.

D.M.

26

G.R.S. VI-71]

SUBJECT..... Confirmation of the Dy. Comrs. order appointing Syed Abdul Karim Khadri alias Saheb Peer, son of the elder sister of the deceased Khazi of the Kunigal Taluk.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No. 8

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue.... 3.6.1905

Signed by.....

Read.— Petition regd. no. 4175 of 5th May 1905 from Syed Mukdum Hussein of Kunigal appealing against the Deputy Comrs. order directing that Syed Abdul Karim Khadri alias Saheb Peer, son of the elder sister of the deceased Khazi be appointed as the Khazi of the Kunigal Taluk.

Correspondence ending with letter no. 1588 dated

May this be

i Printed?

ii treated as a standing order?

iii published in the Gazette English part?

iv translated?

v placed at the disposal of the press?

vi published in the Gazette Kannada part?

Order Thereon:— No.

over.

16th April 1919 from the
Dy. Comr, Dharwar Distt,
Submitting the records
& enquiry connected with
the case.

Order thereon. No. 1127/Misc/05-06-A Enclosure
1 M.
5.

The late Khazi of the
Kunigal Taluk – Syed Ally – who
died a S a bachelor ~~and~~
had 2 Sisters. The appellant
claims the office as the
husband of the late Khazi's
younger Sister, ~~wife~~ The
elder Sister was married
to the respondent Syed Abdul
Razak Sha Khadri whose
son Syed Abdul Karim
Khadri alias Saheb Peer
has been appointed as
Khazi by the Dy Comr. Copied by
Syed Hukkum Hussain Examined by
appeals against the order,
husband of the younger sister

List of enclosures.

3 R S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

and claims the office for his minor Son

The Case was heard before Court on 29th July 1910. In the course of hearing the apll represented an agnate of the deceased, and complained that all his witness were examined, the case was remanded to the Dy Commr for getting the statements of remaining witnesses recorded and for furnishing his opinion on the whole evidence concerning the merits of the claim. The Dy. Commr has submitted the record of enquiry and the further evidence recorded during the course has added strength to the apll's allegation of relationship with the D

Apllo Sen and Respo Sen
~~Sisters~~ are both Sisters' Sons and
~~Respo Sen~~ being the ~~eldest~~
~~the office being indivisible, he~~
is a preferable claimant
for the office. The Dy Comm's
~~order appealed against~~, is
therefore confirmed, and the
appeal dismissed.

17.3.19

(Sd) Secretary,
Mus-Dept
17/9/19

To
The Dy. Comm, Nellore
Dist, with the ~~records~~.